

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 298 380

CG 021 061

AUTHOR Black, Mary Kathryn; Best, Deborah L.
TITLE Relationship between Men's and Women's Religious Views and Sex-Typing.
PUB DATE Mar 88
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southeastern Psychological Association (34th, New Orleans, LA, March 31-April 2, 1988).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Androgyny; *Beliefs; *Empathy; *Religion; Religious Factors; *Sex Differences; *Sex Role

ABSTRACT

Although few psychological studies which include religion as a variable discriminate among the religious, those for whom religion is important differ in their theological orientation and consequently reflect diverse viewpoints. This study was conducted to make such a discrimination in order to assess the relationship of religious orientation and concern for others with gender and sex-typing. Fifty male and 50 female subjects completed a variety of religious measures in addition to measures of empathy, guilt, and sex roles. Responses to the Personal Attributes Questionnaire were used to classify subjects as androgynous, masculine, or feminine. The results revealed that male subjects showed less religious concern and had lower scores on measures of empathy and other variables which assessed orientation toward others than did female respondents. For traditional males, a sex-stereotypic self-description was found to be related to fundamentalist religious beliefs. These males also scored lower on measures that reflected concern for others than did any of the other sex-typing groups. Various aspects of an evangelical/fundamentalist worldview were also negatively associated with several measures that reflected an orientation to others. The findings suggest that religious views and concern for others are related to gender and to self-perceptions of masculinity and femininity. (Ten tables are appended.) (NB)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy.

Relationship Between Men's and Women's

Religious Views and Sex-Typing

Mary Kathryn Black and Deborah L. Best

Wake Forest University

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Mary Kathryn
Black

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

There is a growing awareness of the importance of religion in American life. Accompanying this awareness of the importance of religion is an awareness of the controversies within religion, and within religion the controversy regarding the role of women has been particularly intense. It is interesting, therefore, to explore the relationship between religious views and sex-typing.

Several studies in psychology have explored this relationship. In cross-cultural studies, Williams and Best (1982) found that religion plays an important role in the determination of sex-appropriate attributes. Other studies have shown a positive relationship between religious commitment and stereotypic gender-role attributes (Fannin, 1971; Morgan, 1987). Furthermore, an evangelical/fundamentalist worldview has been related to traditional views of the family and sex roles (Hammond & Hunter, 1984). It would seem, therefore, that those high in evangelical/fundamentalist belief would describe themselves using traditional sex stereotypes.

Because traditional sex-stereotypes depict women as expressive and men as instrumental, it is logical that a relationship would exist between sex-typing and variables that reflect concern for others such as empathy. Therefore, men who define themselves using traditional sex-stereotypes should score lower on measures that assess an orientation toward others. Traditional females, however, would not necessarily score higher on measures of an orientation toward others compared with other sex-typing groups as they are characterized

ED 298380

CG 021061

by a lack of instrumental qualities although high in expressive concerns. Males and females who are androgynous, on the other hand, are high in both expressiveness and instrumentality. Only males who describe themselves with traditional male stereotypes, then, should lack an orientation to the needs and concerns of others.

Moreover, in considering the relationship between religion and orientation to others, Batson (1983) has suggested that religion that has a kinship imagery and, therefore, an universalistic or inclusive orientation should serve as a cognitive bridge to generalize this identity with others and strengthen an empathic response. In contrast, religion with an exclusive orientation, such as evangelical/fundamentalism, which encourages compassion to those of like mind like excluding others, should diminish empathy. Therefore, aspects of religion that reflect an evangelical/fundamentalist worldview should be negatively or not correlated with measures of empathy and variables that reflect a concern for others. Measures of religion that reflect a kinship imagery, however, should be positively associated with empathy and variables that reflect an orientation to others. Thus, research and theory suggest that a relationship exists between religious orientation, orientation to others, and sex-typing.

Although religion is of interest in psychology, few studies in psychology which include religion as a variable discriminate among the religious. Yet those for whom religion is important differ in their theological orientation and consequently reflect diverse viewpoints. Therefore, this study's purpose was to make such a discrimination in order to assess the relationship of religious orientation and concern for others with gender and sex-typing.

To assess theological orientation, two measures were used: The first measure of religious orientation was that of Evangelical Beliefs and Evangelical Worldview (Hammond & Hunter, 1984). Several indices constitute the measure of these beliefs and attitudes. The measure of evangelical/fundamentalist belief is the Evangelical Index, which comprises six questions generally regarded as central to a fundamentalist/evangelical outlook. The Piety Index measures the frequency of certain religious exercises such as reading the Bible and attending church. The Traditional Familism Index assesses attitudes toward divorce, equality of sex roles, strict disciplining of children, etc. The Legislation of Morality Index measures attitudes toward the use of legislation to ban abortions, reinstate school prayer, etc. The final measure, the Moral Absolutism Index assesses the view that it is always wrong to tell small lies, see x-rated films, etc.

The second measure of religious orientation was the Love and Guilt-Oriented Dimensions of Christian Belief Scale (McConahay & Hough, 1973). This measure assesses three dimensions of religious belief related to the Love-Guilt complex in Christian theology as well as a fourth dimension of conventionalism or culture-oriented belief. The Guilt-Oriented scale expresses a concern with God's wrath and punishment; it reflects the belief that both the self and others are unworthy, should be punished, and should suffer. An example of an item is "Nobody in the world is good, least of all am I." The Love-Oriented, Self-Centered scale focuses on God's love for the self. An example is "The important thing in religion to me is the knowledge that God loves me like parents love their children." The Love-Oriented, Other-Centered scale assesses belief in God's love for all persons. Those

whose religious orientation falls primarily on this dimension would be expected to show more humanitarian interests. An example of an item is "If a person wants to serve God, let that person serve humanity." The two love-oriented scales correlate in opposite directions with a scale of Attitudes toward Church Involvement in Social Action with the love-oriented, other-centered orientation correlating positively and the love-oriented self-oriented orientation correlating negatively. The fourth scale is that of conventional religion, and an example of the item is, "Americans who are really good Americans are interested in the church." McConahay and Hough hypothesized that this scale would correlate positively with the Guilt and with the Love-Oriented, Self-Centered scales. This proved to be true and suggests that the religion of American culture emphasizes guilt, individual piety, and personal salvation, but not love for others.

In addition to these two measures of religious orientation, several other measures of religion were included in the present study. The Life Purpose questionnaire (Hilty, Morgan, & Burns, 1984) assesses general life purpose. An example of a scale item is "My life is full of joy and satisfaction." The Social Conscience Scale (Hilty et al., 1984) measures belief concerning the church's role in society. A representative item is "The church should take the lead in ending injustice." The measure of Intolerance of Ambiguity (Hilty et al., 1984) comprises items that assess rigid categorical thinking. An example is "You can classify all people as either honest or crooked."

Three measures of religious salience, the importance and meaningfulness of religion for an individual, were administered. Six items (Wimberly, 1984) examined the importance of various aspects of religion. A representative item

is "My religious experience is important to me." An example of an item from the Religious Salience: Cognition Scale (King & Hunt, 1975) is "My religious beliefs are what really lie behind my whole approach to life." Three additional items (Hilty et al., 1984) that relate to religious salience were included. A representative item is "God has influenced my life significantly."

A measure of Idealism from the Ethics Position Questionnaire (Forsyth, 1980) was also used. This measure reflects the degree to which others believe in and make use of moral absolutes in making judgments. A sample item is: "A person should make sure that their actions never intentionally harm another even to a small degree."

Another scale, Women in the Church, was designed specifically for this study to assess attitudes toward roles of women in the church (Black & Boyd, 1987). Sample items are: "Women should be ordained as priests/pastors," and "God has both male and female qualities."

Sex-typing measures included the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ, Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1974) and the Sex-Stereotype Index from the Adjective Check List (ACL; Williams & Best, 1977; 1982). The PAQ consists of three scales composed of bipolar items: the Sex-Specific scale, the Female-Valued scale, and the Male-Valued scale. Items were assigned to these three scales based on the ratings by college students of the ideal male and ideal female on the Sex-Role Stereotype Questionnaire (Rosenkrantz, Vogel, Bee, Broverman, & Broverman, 1968). For the items constituting the Sex-Specific scale, the mean ratings of the ideal male and female differed in direction. The ratings of the ideal female were toward the stereotypically feminine end of the pole and those of the ideal male toward the

stereotypically masculine end of the pole. The Sex-Specific scale includes such bipolar items as "very aggressive, not aggressive," "very dominant, very submissive," and "very little need for security, very strong need for security." The Female-Valued scale comprises items for which the mean of both the ideal male and ideal female were toward the feminine end of the scale. This scale includes such bipolar items as "very aware of the feelings of others, not at all aware of the feelings of others," "very helpful to others, not at all helpful to others," and "very warm in relations with others, very cold in relations with others." These items refer to what Parsons and Bales (1955) have called expressive behavior and reflect a communion with and sensitivity to others. For the items constituting the Male-Valued scale, the mean ratings of the ideal male and female were toward the masculine extreme. The Male-Valued scale includes such bipolar items as "very active, very passive," "very competitive, not at all competitive," "stands up well under pressure, goes to pieces under pressure," and reflects what Parsons and Bales have labelled instrumental behaviors.

The Sex-Stereotype Index (SSI) ratings were obtained from the Adjective Check List (Gough & Heilbrun, 1965) using a system devised by Williams and Best (1977). Using the ACL, subjects identified adjectives that described themselves, the SSI ratings for these adjectives were summed, and the mean ratings derived for each subject. Scores above 500 have some degree of male stereotype loading -- the greater the deviation about 500 the greater the loading. In comparable manner, items with scores below 500 have differing degrees of female stereotype loading -- the greater the deviation below 500 the greater the loading.

Variables that reflect an orientation to others included the Interpersonal Reactivity Index (Davis, 1983) and the Nurturing Parent Scale of the ACL (Williams & Williams, 1980). The Interpersonal Reactivity Index includes four scales each with seven items. The Perspective-Taking scale measures the tendency to adopt the point of view of others. A sample item is "I sometimes try to understand my friends better by imagining how things look from their perspective." The Fantasy Empathy scale measures the tendency to transpose oneself into the feelings and actions of fictitious characters in books, movies, and plays. A sample item from this scale is "I really get involved with the feelings of the characters in a novel." The Empathic Concern scale measures the tendency to experience feelings of warmth, compassion, and concern for other people. A sample item is "I often have tender, concerned feelings for people less fortunate than me." The Personal Distress scale assesses feelings of discomfort in tense emotional situations. An example of an item is "Being in a tense emotional situation scares me."

Because Hoffman (1982) has contended that empathy is associated with guilt in that it sensitizes one to the ways in which one harms others, the Mosher Guilt Scales (Mosher, 1966), which assess a predisposition to experience guilt, were used. The Hostility Guilt scale assesses guilt for aggressive actions and feelings. The Sex Guilt scale measures guilt over sexual actions and fantasies. The Morality Conscience scale reflects guilt over traditionally disapproved acts.

In the present study it was hypothesized that: (1) Females would evidence a different religious orientation than males. (2) For males and females high in empathy and an orientation toward others, measures of

evangelical/fundamentalist worldview would be negatively correlated while religious variables assessing aspects of religion not exclusive to evangelical/fundamentalism, such as salience or humanitarian aspects of religion, would be positively correlated. (3) Traditional males would score lower on measures of religion and orientation toward others than the other sex-role groups. (4) An evangelical/fundamentalist religious orientation would relate to traditional sex-typing.

Males and females were categorized as androgynous, masculine, or feminine using the PAQ to make these determinations. Table 2 shows the differences on sex-role measures for these groups. The scores on these sex-role measures for the various sex-role groupings indicate that the groups reflect the appropriate characteristics.

Table 3 lists the scores on religious measures. Females were higher than males on evangelical/fundamentalist belief (a low score reflects higher evangelical/fundamentalist belief), religious salience, guilt, women in the church, and idealism, while males were higher than females on Intolerance of Ambiguity. For androgynous males and females, however, none of the differences between scores on the religious measures was significant. In addition, the pattern of means shows that masculine or traditional males have the lowest scores on many of these measures, except for Intolerance of Ambiguity on which they score the highest. For comparative purposes the scores of the feminine females are shown, but with an n of 5, little confidence can be attached to these results.

Table 4 shows the means for empathy and several variables that also reflect an orientation toward others. Males and females differed

significantly on empathy and perspective-taking. Thus, females more so than males experience feelings of warmth, compassion, and concern for others, and are better able to adopt the point of view of others. The means for nurturing parent, the tendency to promote growth in and express nurturance toward others, approached significance, $p < .06$. Notice that for androgynous males and females there were no differences between the means on the variables that reflect an orientation toward others. Also, the pattern of means for masculine males shows them to be the lowest on all these measures, with the exception of personal distress.

Tables 5-10 show the pattern of correlations between measures for the different groups designated by sex roles.

The hypotheses were confirmed in that religious variables, such as salience and life purpose, which are not associated exclusively with an evangelical/fundamentalist worldview, were generally positively correlated with variables that reflect an orientation toward others, particularly for males. However, religious variables that reflect an evangelical/fundamentalist worldview were negatively associated or not correlated with only one exception. Thus, these findings support Batson's (1983) hypothesis that religion with a kinship imagery strengthens empathic response while an exclusive religious orientation lessens empathy.

Not only do males and females differ in their predisposition to experience empathy, for males and females the correlates of empathic concern are different. For females, only idealism and perspective-taking correlate with this variable. For males, however, there are numerous correlates, including religious salience and religious variables that reflect an

orientation toward others, such as other-centered, social justice, and women in the church. This may indicate as Feshbach (1982) has suggested that, for males, empathy is a more complex process. Moreover, for females, the correlates with empathy are cognitive in nature while for men, measures of guilt are related. These findings do not support Feshbach's (1982) contention that the access for empathy in males may be more cognitive in nature. In addition, for males, with the exception of nurturing parent, empathic concern correlated with all the variables that reflect an orientation toward others: perspective-taking, social justice, other-centered, fantasy empathy, and women in the church.

While males and females who are androgynous do not differ on measures of empathy and other variables that reflect an orientation toward others, the variables that correlate with empathy and measures of an other-orientation are different for males and females who are androgynous. This provides further support for the hypothesis that the factors that contribute to empathy are different for males and females.

Of special interest is that for masculine males (see Table 9), Evangelical/Fundamentalist Belief was associated with the Sex-Specific subscale of the PAQ and with the Sex-Stereotype Index of the ACL. This indicates that for traditional males an evangelical/fundamentalist religious orientation is related to the use of male stereotypes in self-descriptions.

This research indicates that males show less religious concern and have lower scores on measures of empathy and other variables which assess orientation toward others than females. Moreover, for traditional males, a sex-stereotypic self-description is related to fundamentalist religious

beliefs. In addition, these males score lower on measures that reflect concern for others than any of the other sex-typing groups. Various aspects of an evangelical/fundamentalist worldview are also negatively associated with several measures that reflect an orientation to others. It does appear, therefore, that religious views and concern for others are related to gender and to self-perceptions of masculinity and femininity. However, little work has been done to explore the relationship of religion to these areas. In the future we would like to identify more feminine females in order to learn more about the pattern of relationships with the religious and empathic variables for this sample.

References

- Batson, C. D. (1983). Sociobiology and the role of religion in promoting prosocial behavior: An alternative view. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 45, 1380-1385.
- Black, M. K., & Boyd, S. (1987). Unpublished manuscript.
- Davis, M. H. (1983). Measuring individual differences in empathy: Evidence for a multidimensional approach. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 44, 113-126.
- Fannin, P. M. (1971). The relation between ego-identity status and sex-role attitude, work-role salience, atypicality of major, and self-esteem in college women. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 14, 12-22/
- Feshbach, N. C. (1982). Sex differences in empathy and social behavior in children. In N. Eisenberg (Ed.), The development of prosocial behavior (pp. 315-338). New York: Academic Press.
- Forsyth, D. (1980). A taxonomy of ethical ideologies. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 39, 175-184.
- Gough, H. G., & Heilbrun, A. B. (1965). Adjective Check List manual. Palo Alto, CA: Counseling Psychologists Press.
- Hammond, P. E., & Hunter, J. P. (1984). On maintaining plausibility: The worldview of evangelical students. The Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 23, 221-238.
- Hilty, D. M., Morgan, R. L., & Burns, J. E. (1984). King and Hunt revisited: Dimensions of religious involvement. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 23, 252-266.

- Hoffman, M. L. (1982). Development of prosocial motivation: Empathy and guilt. In M. Eisenberg (Ed.), The development of prosocial behavior (pp. 281-313). New York: Academic Press.
- King, M. B., & Hunt, R. A. (1975). Measuring the religious variable. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 14, 13-22.
- McConahay, J. B., & Hough, J. C. (1973). The love and guilt-oriented dimensions of christian belief. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 12, 53-64.
- Morgan, M. Y. (1987). The impact of religion on gender-role attitudes. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 11, 301-310.
- Mosher, D. L. (1966). The development and multitrait-multimethod matrix analysis of three measures of three aspects of guilt. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 30, 25-29.
- Parsons, T., & Bales, R. F. (1955). Family, socialization, and interaction process. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- Rosenkrantz, P. S., Vogel, S. R., Bee, H., Broverman, I. K., & Broverman, D. M. (1968). Sex-role stereotypes and self-concepts in college students. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 32, 287-295.
- Spence, J. T., Helmreich, R., & Stapp, J. (1975). Ratings of self and peers on sex role attributes and their relation to self-esteem and conceptions of masculinity and femininity. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 32, 29-39.
- Williams, J. E., & Best, D. L. (1977). Sex stereotypes and trait favorability on the ACL. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 37, 101-110.

Williams, J. E., & Best, D. L. (1982). Measuring sex stereotypes. Beverly

Hills, CA: Sage.

Williams, K. B., & Williams, J. E. (1980). The assessment of transactional analysis ego states via the Adjective Check List. Journal of Personality Assessment, 44, 120-129.

Wimberly, D. W. (1984). Socioeconomic deprivation and religious salience: A cognitive-behavioral approach. The Sociological Quarterly, 25, 223-238.

Table 1

Measures Used

Religious Measures:

Evangelical/Fundamentalist Worldview:

Evangelical Index

Piety

Traditional Familism

Legislation of Morality

Moral Absolutism

Intolerance of Ambiguity

Life Purpose

Religious Salience

Social Justice

Women in the Church

Love-Guilt Dimension:

Guilt

Love-Oriented, Self-Centered

Love-Oriented, Other-Centered

Conventional Religion

Empathy/Other-Oriented Measures:

Interpersonal Reactivity Index:

Empathic Concern

Perspective Taking

Fantasy Empathy

Personal Distress

ACL Scores:

Nurturing Parent

Guilt Measures:

Mosher Guilt Scales:

Hostility Guilt

Sex Guilt

Morality Conscience

Sex Role Measures:

ACL Score:

Sex-Stereotype Index

PAQ Scores:

Sex Specific

Male Valued

Female Valued

Table 2

Sex Role Measures

	n = 50	n = 50	n = 15	n = 19	n = 19	n = 5
	Males	Females	Androgynous Males	Females	Masculine Males	Feminine Females
<u>ACL Score</u>						
Sex Stereotype Index	522.63*	479.00 ^x	520.00*	486.00	530.1 ^x	431.80 ^x
<u>PAQ Scores</u>						
Sex Specific	17.08 ^x	13.8 ^x	16.8	14.95	18.32 ^x	8.00 ^x
Male Valued	23.00*	20.78*	26.07	23.90	25.16 ^x	16.6 ^x
Female Valued	23.32	23.20	26.20	26.42	19.95 ^x	25.8 ^x

*Pairs of means are significantly different at $p < .05$.

^xPairs of means are significantly different at $p < .01$.

Table 3

Religious Measures

	n = 50	n = 50	n = 15	n = 19	n = 19	n = 5
	Male	Female	Androgynous Male	Androgynous Female	Masculine Male	Feminine Female
Evangelical/ Fundamentalist Belief	13.46*	12.4*	12.20	12.40	14.11	11.8
Intolerance of Ambiguity	27.04*	23.36*	26.73	26.68	27.95	26.8
Religious Salience	52.28 ^x	61.54 ^x	59.13	63.68	45.74 ^x	59.6 ^x
Guilt	13.94 ^x	16.02 ^x	15.53	16.90	13.05*	16.40*
Conventional Religion	15.16	14.98	15.80	15.68	14.74	17.60
Social Justice	25.76	27.30	28.60	27.36	23.42	25.20
Other-Centered	18.74	18.26	20.13	18.36	17.89	16.40
Women in the Church	38.64*	41.80*	42.27	41.16	34.84	39.60
Idealism	49.74 ^x	59.48 ^x	51.00	59.21	48.21	59.00

*Pairs of means are significantly different at $p < .05$.

^xPairs of means are significantly different at $p < .01$.

Table 4

Empathy/Other-Oriented Variables

	n = 50	n = 50	n = 15	n = 19	n = 19	n = 5
	Male	Female	Androgynous Male	Androgynous Female	Masculine Male	Feminine Female
<u>Interpersonal Reactivity Index</u>						
Empathic Concern	26.44*	28.24*	28.40	29.05	24.63*	28.40*
Perspective-Taking	23.02 ^x	25.62 ^x	26.10	26.63	21.05	24.20
Fantasy Empathy	22.98	23.78	22.93	24.31	21.79	24.40
Personal Distress	17.67	19.06	16.20	18.10	16.95	19.40
<u>ACL Score</u>						
Nurturing Parent	25.91	27.09	26.70	27.71	24.80	26.08

*Pairs of means are significantly different at $p < .05$.

^xPairs of means are significantly different at $p < .01$.

Table 5

Correlations Between Measures for Male Subjects

<u>Empathic Concern</u>		<u>Perspective Taking</u>		<u>Fantasy Empathy</u>	
Religious Salience	.39 ^x	Intolerance of Ambiguity	-.32*	Social Justice	.28*
Other-Centered	.29*	Religious Salience	.37 ^x	Empathic Concern	.34*
Self-Centered	.37 ^x	Empathic Concern	.37 ^x	Idealism	.38 ^x
Social Justice	.30*	Hostility Guilt	.44 ^x	Hostility Guilt	.31*
Women in Church	.63 ^x				
Perspective-Taking	.37 ^x	<u>Social Justice</u>		<u>Women in the Church</u>	
Fantasy Empathy	.34*	Other-Centered	.35*	Traditional Familism	-.39 ^x
Hostility Guilt	.55 ^x	Women in Church	.37 ^x	Legislation of Morality	-.52 ^x
Morality Conscience	.43 ^x	Legislation of Morality	-.38 ^x	Empathic Concern	.63 ^x
Female-Valued	.30*	Empathic Concern	.30*	Social Justice	.37 ^x
Sex-Stereotype Index	-.35*	Fantasy Empathy	.29*	Other-Centered	.47 ^x
				Female-Valued	.30*
		<u>Other-Centered</u>		Hostility Guilt	.36*
		Legislation of Morality	-.42 ^x		
		Social Justice	.34 ^x	<u>Nurturing Parent</u>	
		Women in Church	.47 ^x	Sex Stereotype Index	-.35*
		Empathic Concern	.29*		

*Correlations significant at $p < .05$ ^xCorrelations significant at $p < .01$

Table 6

Correlations Between Measures for Female Subjects

<u>Empathic Concern</u>		<u>Perspective-Taking</u>	
Perspective-Taking	.57 ^x	Empathic Concern	.57 ^x
Idealism	.35 ^x	Idealism	.32*
		Nurturing Parent	.36 ^x
<u>Fantasy Empathy</u>		Piety	.32*
Hostility Guilt	.29*	Life Purpose	.42 ^x
<u>Women in the Church</u>		<u>Nurturing Parent</u>	
Intolerance of Ambiguity	-.53*	Male-Valued	-.51*
Legislation of Morality	-.71 ^x	Sex Guilt	.62*
Empathic Concern	.54*	Hostility Guilt	.55*
Perspective-Taking	.52*	<u>Social Justice</u>	
Social Justice	.58*	Traditional Familism	-.66 ^x
Other-Centered	.59*	Legislation of Morality	-.57*
<u>Other-Centered</u>		Idealism	.61*
Legislation of Morality	-.52*	Other-Centered	.65 ^x
Idealism	.53*	Women in the Church	.58*
Social Justice	.65 ^x		
Women in the Church	.59*		

*Correlation significant at $p < .05$ ^xCorrelation significant at $p < .01$

Table 7

Correlations Between Measures for Androgynous Males

<u>Empathic Concern</u>		<u>Perspective-Taking</u>	
Intolerance of Ambiguity	-.59*	Intolerance of Ambiguity	-.60*
Life Purpose	.53*	Empathic Concern	.60*
Perspective-Taking	.60*	Women in the Church	.52*
Sex Guilt	.58*		
Hostility Guilt	.59*	<u>Women in the Church</u>	
		Intolerance of Ambiguity	-.53*
<u>Nurturing Parent</u>		Social Justice	.58*
Sex Guilt	.62*	Legislation of Morality	-.71 ^x
Hostility Guilt	.55*	Other-Centered	.59*
Male-Valued	.52*	Empathic Concern	.54*
		Perspective-Taking	.52*
<u>Social Justice</u>			
Traditional Familism	-.66*	<u>Other-Centered</u>	
Legislation of Morality	-.57*	Legislation of Morality	-.52*
Other-Centered	.65 ^x	Social Justice	.65 ^x
Women in the Church	.58*	Women in the Church	.59*
Idealism	.61*	Idealism	.53*

*Correlation significant at $p < .05$ ^xCorrelation significant at $p < .01$

Table 8

Correlations Between Measures for Androgynous Females

<u>Empathic Concern</u>		<u>Perspective-Taking</u>	
Life Purpose	.52*	Life Purpose	.58 ^x
Religious Salience	.53*	Other-Centered	.64 ^x
Social Justice	.56*	Empathic Concern	.52*
Other-Centered	.49*		
Idealism	.54*	<u>Women in the Church</u>	
Perspective-Taking	.52*	Religious Salience	.50*
		Nurturing Parent	-.52*
<u>Nurturing Parent</u>		<u>Other-Centered</u>	
Women in the Church	-.52*	Evangelical/ Fundamentalist Belief	-.55*
<u>Social Justice</u>		Life Purpose	.47*
Evangelical/ Fundamentalist Belief	-.54*	Social Justice	.50*
Other-Centered	.50*	Empathic Concern	.49*
Empathic Concern	.56*	Perspective-Taking	.64 ^x
Sex-Stereotype Index	.54*	Fantasy Empathy	.50*
<u>Fantasy Empathy</u>			
Other-Centered	.50*		
Hostility Guilt	.50*		

*Correlation significant at $p < .05$ ^xCorrelation significant at $p < .01$

Table 9

Correlations Between Measures for Masculine Males

<u>Empathic Concern</u>		<u>Perspective-Taking</u>	
Women in the Church	.60 ^x	Morality Conscience	.62 ^x
Hostility Guilt	.48*	Female Valued	.53 ^x
Morality Conscience	.50 ^x		
Female Valued	.51 ^x	<u>Women in the Church</u>	
		Traditional Familism	-.59 ^x
<u>Nurturing Parent</u>		Empathic Concern	.58 ^x
Piety	.65 ^x		
Female Valued	.51 ^x	<u>Other-Centered</u>	
		Religious Salience	.61 ^x
<u>Social Justice</u>		Evangelical	
Life Purpose	-.60 ^x	Fundamentalist Belief	.52 ^x
<u>Sex-Specific</u>		<u>Fantasy Empathy</u>	
Evangelical		Moral Absolutism	-.56*
Fundamentalist Belief	.56*	Idealism	.56 ^x
<u>Sex-Stereotype Index</u>			
Evangelical			
Fundamentalist Belief	.66 ^x		

*Correlation significant at $p < .05$ ^xCorrelation significant at $p < .01$

Table 10

Correlations Between Measures for Feminine Females

<u>Empathic Concern</u>		<u>Perspective-Taking</u>	
<u>Nurturing Parent</u>		Guilt	.93*
Guilt	.96 ^x	Women in the Church	-.99 ^x
Sex Guilt	.90*	Piety	.95*
Male Valued	-.90*	<u>Women in the Church</u>	
<u>Social Justice</u>		Guilt	-.95*
Moral Absolutism	.89*	Piety	.96 ^x
Fantasy Empathy	.91*	Perspective-Taking	-.99 ^x
Morality Conscience	.91*	Critical Parent	.89 ^x
<u>Fantasy Empathy</u>			
Social Justice	.90*		

*Correlation significant at $p < .05$ ^xCorrelation significant at $p < .01$